DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 211 203 PS 012 578

AUTHOR	Friendly, Martha; Johnson, Laura C.
TITLE	Perspectives on Work-Related Day Care. Child in the City Report No. 11.
INSTITUTION	Toronto Univ. (Ontario). Centre for Urban and Community Studies.
REPORT NO	ISBN-0-7727-1212-3
PUB DATE	Apr 81
NOTE	32p.; Paper presented at the Conference on Work-Related Day Care (Toronto, Canada, May 5, 1981).
AVAILABLE FROM	Centre for Urban and Community Studies, University of Toronto, 150 St. George Street, Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5A 1A1 ($2.00).
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Day Care; Day Care Centers; Early Childhood Education; Employed Parents; *Employer Employee Relationship; Family Day Care; Financial Support; Fringe Benefits; History; *Models; Program Administration; *Unions
IDENTIFIERS	Canada; *Employer Supported Child Care; United States

ABSTRACT

This paper provides background information and a preliminary discussion of issues to be addressed during a one-day conference on "Future Directions in Work-Related Day Care," sponsored jointly by the Child in the City program and the Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto. After describing the context, needs and historical development of work-related day care in the United States and Canada, the authors outline alternative models through which these kinds of services may be provided, and discuss the special role of organized labor in expanding opportunities for the provision of day care at the work-place. The advantages for both employers and parents, and the central issues involved in organizing work-related day care are summarized. (Author/MP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
X Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED211203

PERSPECTIVES ON

WORK-RELATED DAY CARE

Martha Friendly* and Laura C. Johnson**

CHILD IN THE CITY REPORT NO. 11

* Research Coordinator
Child in the City Programme, University of Toronto

** Programme Director
The Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto

The Child in the City Programme
and
The Centre for Urban and Community Studies
University of Toronto

April 1981

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Martha Friendly
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

This paper was prepared for
A Conference on Work-Related Day Care

co-sponsored by
The Child in the City Programme and
The Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto

Toronto, May 5, 1981

ISSN: 0225-0438
ISBN: 0-7727-1212-3

PS 01 2578

FORWARD

This paper has been written to provide background information and a preliminary discussion of issues to be addressed during a one-day conference on Future Directions in Work-Related Day Care sponsored jointly by the Child in the City programme and the Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto. After describing the context, needs and historical development of work-related day care in the United States and Canada, the authors outline alternative models through which these kinds of services may be provided, and discuss the special role of organized labour in expanding opportunities for the provision of day care at the work-place. The advantages for both employers and parents, and the central issues involved in organizing work-related day care are each summarized.

The questions surrounding this topic are of critical importance. While it may be inevitable that the organization and provision of work-related day care emerge from a convergence of both employers' and employees' interests, we should at no time lose sight of the rights and interests of the ultimate consumers of the service - the children themselves. The question of the quality of day care provided is no less important than the question of expanding ways in which the quantity of work-related day care might be increased.

Howard F. Andrews
Director
Child in the City programme

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	WORK-RELATED DAY CARE IN CONTEXT	1
II.	THE NEED FOR DAY CARE	2
III.	THE HISTORY OF WORK-RELATED DAY CARE	5
IV.	MODELS OF WORK-RELATED DAY CARE	7
	A. On-Site Day Care	8
	B. Off-Site Day Care Centres	11
	C. The Consortium Model	11
	D. Indirect Support of Work-Related Day Care	12
V.	LABOUR UNIONS: A SPECIAL ROLE	13
VI.	BENEFITS OF WORK-RELATED DAY CARE	15
	A. Benefits to Employers	15
	B. Benefits to Parents	16
VII.	KEY ISSUES IN WORK-RELATED DAY CARE	17
	A. Management of Work-Related Day care	18
	B. User Population	19
	C. Work Settings	20
	D. Programme Funding	21
VIII.	CONCLUSION	23
	REFERENCES	

I. WORK-RELATED DAY CARE IN CONTEXT

Under the pressure of extremely rapid change in modern life, the needs of contemporary North American families are different from what they were a generation or even a decade ago. According to our customary pattern of family living, the father went out of the home to work and the mother worked within the home, providing care for children and tending to the duties of the household. The last decade has seen a dramatic upsurge in the labour force participation of women. One consequence of this change is, of course, the need to find alternative forms of care for the youngsters of working parents. Substitute child care arrangements exist in various forms, including in-home, family and group day care. Such arrangements are provided under many auspices, and offered in a variety of settings within the residential community as well as at the work-site.

Of all of the existing forms of day care, work-related group day care is perhaps the most controversial. While the traditional locus for child care has been the child's own home, those who wish to preserve the family in its customary pattern tend to seek alternative child care solutions which come as close as possible to the traditional model. Thus, among available forms of substitute child care, the most attractive solutions seem to many to be those child care arrangements which are within the child's own neighbourhood, located physically close to the family's own home. Among the available modes of care, traditionalists tend to support family day care (in which a provider - generally a woman - offers care within her own home) over the group day care setting. Many people look with skepticism at the idea of group day care provided within the work-place setting. Transportation of a young child away from his home, out of his own neighbourhood, into a work setting, is thus perceived as a threat to the continuity of the family and the community.

Surveys of working parents in the United States and Canada have indicated that a majority would prefer to have day care facilities for their children located close to home (Whitbread, 1979; Johnson, 1977). The reality of the situation, however, is that few parents in contemporary North American society have

such an alternative. Finding high quality reliable day care at affordable prices, conveniently located close to home, is a rare occurrence.

Transportation out of neighbourhoods, long rush-hour trips on public transit, early mornings and late bedtimes are commonplace among the young children of working parents. In fact, parents often consider themselves and their children fortunate if they can locate an acceptable child care arrangement which is en route to their place of work, rather than being off in an opposite direction from their required commuting route. There are many families today for whom the introduction of work-site day care would actually decrease the time and distance travelled by young children.

A system of services including a range of options, access to which is based on parents' and children's individual needs and preferences, is necessary to accomodate the wide variety of families who use day care. Families of varying compositions, occupations and life styles require day care for varying hours, locations and programmes. A full system of day care services which would provide a range of options for parents should include group day care in residential communities, supervised family day care programmes which could take advantage of support and subsidy services, in-home care, school-age care, part-time care, care for shiftworkers and care at or near work-places. The latter option, work-related day care, is an underdeveloped resource in North America. It is, however, an option which merits serious attention. Work-related day care, sponsored by employers, unions, or other employee groups, has considerable potential to help in meeting the rapidly growing need for day care.

II. THE NEED FOR DAY CARE

During the decade we have already entered, 1980 - 1990, it appears likely that the need and demand for day care in North America will expand even more than it has previously. There are several reasons for this. Although individual family size has declined and is likely to remain smaller

than it was in previous generations, there will continue to be a considerable population of preschoolers in the next decade. These children will be the offspring of the young women of the "baby boom" of post-World War II to the early 1960's, many of whom postponed having babies until at least their mid- to late '20's (and for women seriously engaged in pursuing careers, even later) (Hofferth, Statistics Canada, 1978).

The rising labour force participation rate of women has been, and will continue to be, even more important in its effect on the demand for day care. Single mothers and partners in dual-career families, women working to keep a family above the poverty line and those competing for top career positions - all of these have contributed to a trend that shows no signs of abating (Statistics Canada, 1981). Even more dramatic has been the increase in the percentage of married women and, in particular, mothers of preschoolers, who are working (Statistics Canada, 1975, 1980).

In Canada, the labour force participation rate of married women with at least one child under three years rose from 30.9% in 1975 to 41.5% in 1980 (Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey, 1975, 1980). Within the Province of Ontario, the corresponding figures indicate a rise in participation rate for women with children under the age of three from 36.6% in 1975 to 48.1% in 1980. Canadian and Ontario data reveal even higher rates of labour force participation by mothers of children three years of age and older (Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey, 1975, 1980). Estimates indicate that in Canada in 1979, some 721,000 children under 6 years old had mothers in the labour force (Health and Welfare Canada, 1979; Statistics Canada, 1980). In the United States, the percentage of children under 6 years old with mothers in the labour force increased from 15% in 1965, to 37.6% in 1977, to a projected 44% in 1985 (Grossman, 1974; Hofferth, 1979).

If all these mothers, the traditional child care givers, will be working outside the home, who will take care of the children? First, let us consider

who takes care of the new. Canada in 1979 had a total of 86,780 children under 6 who were in registered centres and family day care homes, representing a total of about 12% of preschool children of working mothers (Health and Welfare Canada, 1979). This is, in fact, a conservative estimate of day care need since only wage earning mothers are defined as in need of care, ignoring parents who are in school, who might require day care for health reasons, or who wish to enter the labour force but cannot for lack of day care. It is estimated that, in the United States, about 8% of preschool children of working parents attend day care centres, including publicly supported, private non-profit and private for-profit centres.

Except for this small minority, working parents in Canada and the United States must rely on a wide array of informal arrangements: leaving children with relatives, older siblings, friends and neighbours, babysitters or nannies; leaving them alone; and sharing of parenting by shift and part-time working parents (Bane, et al, 1979). All these arrangements are unlicensed and unsupervised. Costs run the gamut from free to expensive, sometimes involving an exchange of services and/or goods. These day care arrangements are not, however, eligible for any of the various day care subsidies which exist, nor do they receive support services such as holiday or emergency back-up, or consultation on programmes which might make for better care. If caregivers are unwilling to report their earnings for tax purposes, parents are unable to take advantage of their allowable child care tax deduction. A number of studies have documented parental dissatisfaction with such private arrangements and preference for licensed group day care programmes (Johnson, 1977; Whitbread, 1979; University of Regina, 1980). Further, it has been suggested that, as more women who could be providing private family day care join the formal labour market, such informal care will in the future become a scarcer resource (Hofferth, 1979).

At the same time, a growing body of psychological literature suggests that earlier concerns for the emotional health of children who attend group day care programmes of at least adequate quality from an early age are un-

founded; indeed, high quality group day care is reported to be capable of fulfilling a compensatory function for high risk babies in the area of cognitive development (See Rutter, 1981; Etaugh, 1980; Belsky and Steinberg, 1979, for recent reviews of this literature). Although it seems clear that family type, employment patterns and parents' preferences support provision of a range of day care options, it also seems clear from research and from day care centre waiting lists that the supply of centre spaces in both the United states and Canada is inadequate to meet the parental demand (Bane, 1979; Whitbread, 1979; Johnson, 1977; Metro Toronto Daycare Task Force, 1981; Health and Welfare Canada, 1979).

III. THE HISTORY OF WORK-RELATED DAY CARE

In a sense all day care is work-related since most parents use it in order to work. Nevertheless, it is useful to make the distinction between day care in general and that care which is tied more closely to the place of work - either geographically or by financial support. This considerably narrows the examples which are available for consideration.

The history of children's day care in industrialized countries reaches back into the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries to the development of milltown crèches in France and England. These very early crèches or day nurseries were most often provided by charitable organizations or under religious auspices. Canadian documents record the existence of a crèche in Montreal in 1854 (Pyl, 1977). In the United States, the Boston Infant School is recorded as providing day care for 6 cents per week in 1828 "to enable... mothers... to seek employment". In 1854, the Nursery for the Children of Poor Women at New York Hospital was established to care for children of wet nurses (Steinfels, 1973). This appears to be a very early instance of care provided at a facility for women related to it by their work status.

One account of the history of the American day care movement labels these very early efforts as isolated and "idiosyncratic". Grubb dates the

actual emergence of the day care movement around the 1880's and 1890's and offers the following description of early day care programmes in the United States:

> Most of these day nurseries were established by upper-class women as part of their charity efforts, and many of them were associated with settlement houses. As such, the children who attended them were exclusively from low-income families, where mothers were forced to work; many were, in addition immigrants who, in the view of those running the day nurseries, required socialization in American habits. The day nurseries, like all other aspects of charity efforts, were concerned with the moral uplift of the poor - not only of the children, but of mothers too, encouraging them to take 'socially desirable' occupations and to learn appropriate domestic skills. (Grubb, 1977)

In more recent times, day care in the United States and Canada burgeoned during the World War II period. The Lanham Act in the United States and a cost-sharing arrangement initiated by the Canadian Federal Government led to the establishment of day care centres throughout the United States and in Ontario and Quebec to care for the children of essential female workers (Schulz). Among these centres were several at the work-place, including two 24-hour centres operating at the gates of the W.J. Kaiser Shipyards in Portland, Oregon. During the war years these two centres provided care for some 4,000 children (Stein, 1973). These centres also provided such support services as pre-cooked meals for parents and children, on-site grocery stores, and clothes mending, in order to ease the burden of working parents (Grubb, 1977). The operating costs for these centres came from federal and company subsidies as well as parent fees.

After the war, when it was to the advantage of the post war economy to discourage female workers from remaining in the labour force, most of the wartime day care centres were closed, including those at the Kaiser Shipyards. Public protests saved centres in some places but the wartime flourish of North American day care was over.

Motivated primarily by the labour force needs of an expanding economy, an expansion of day care at industrial sites and hospitals, as well as in other kinds of settings, began in the early 1960's and peaked in the late 1960's and early 1970's. Although most of the new centres were short-lived, some of the hospital and a few of the industrial centres which began operating during this period are still successfully providing day care (Welfare Research, Inc.). Fluctuations in the work force and the economy were cited in this research as accounting for many of the closings.

It appears that a resurgence of interest in work-related day care is occurring in the '80's. At the present time, day care is provided by more than 25 companies in the United States and Canada, more than 100 hospitals, about 14 office buildings (mostly government agencies) more than 1,000 university and college campuses, about 1,000 U.S. military bases, and one American labour union which supports 7 centres. In addition, a number of employers and unions provide or support day care in a variety of other ways. Although in the past centres have opened and closed, recent information suggests new developments in work-related day care. As more sophisticated methods have been developed to assess needs and costs, employers have recognized that day care offers them many advantages. Awareness of tax implications, together with a heightened sense of corporate responsibility and an appreciation of the range of day care possibilities may make work-related day care a key element in a range of day care services in the 1980's.

IV. MODELS OF WORK-RELATED DAY CARE

> "... as soon as you back off from the roar of the foundries, you can hear sounds which can only be coming from children's running and shouting games. A few hundred feet from the main industrial buildings, three smaller buildings house the factory's nursery, where workers' children can be looked after between the ages of eight weeks and four years." (Wolf, 1981)

Although the term work-related day care conjures up images like this one describing an on-site day care centre at a heavy machinery plant in the Peoples' Republic of China, in fact employer or labour union support for day care services may take a variety of forms. Although the most obvious of these is on-site day care at or very near the parents' place of work, this form may not be appropriate in every situation. Other alternatives which have met with success include: off-site care provided by a consortium of employers; providing employees with day care spaces in community-based centres; employer-assisted family day care programmes; information and referral systems; and employers subsidy of day care fees with a voucher or child care allowance. In addition, many employers have instituted or considered various time arrangements such as flextime, part-time work or job sharing and flexible benefit plans. A number of factors need to be examined in determining which direction support for day care should take. These include the available supply of other day care options, modes of transportation to and from work, patterns of work schedules, appropriateness of particular work-sites and available space, demand in an organization or area, available sources and amounts of funding, and commitment of the sponsoring body to providing high quality care.

A. On-Site Day Care

Traditionally, the most popular form of business and labour support for day care has been direct provision of day care at the work-site. Such care has been provided under the auspices of government agencies, insurance companies, hospitals, military installations, broadcast media, and industries manufacturing such products as shoes, clocks, pharmaceuticals, groceries and clothing. On-site day care can be supported by employers, or labour unions or by a cooperative effort between them, and can serve children from infancy through school-age. Services may be restricted to children of employees, or extended to include children of members of a surrounding community.

On-site day care in North America is primarily housed in three kinds of settings: hospitals; industrial sites; and office buildings. In addition, many military installations in the United States and more than 1,000 college

and university campuses in both the United States and Canada have day care centres. Although these latter sites are, indeed, work-sites for many day care users, they are also distinctive communities, as other work-sites which provide day care are not, and for this reason will not be considered here.

Hospitals sponsor the majority of on-site day care programmes at this time. In the United States, some of these centres have been in operation for as long as thirty years. In Canada, a centre at Riverdale Hospital in Toronto has operated since 1964. It has been assumed for some time that one way for hospitals to deal successfully with the shortages of nursing staff which arise periodically is to create on-site day care facilities to attract new nursing staff and to encourage nurses already on staff to return to work quickly following maternity leave (Women's Bureau, United States Department of Labour, 1970). In fact, an extensive survey of work-place day care centres completed by Perry in 1978 reports that recruitment value and reduced job turnover were reported by the bulk of hospitals surveyed (Perry, 1978). Other characteristics of day care centres in hospitals reported by Perry include: extended hours, generally to cover two nursing shifts; a wider age range of children than centres at industrial sites (including more infant and school age care); and less parent involvement in decision making than at other on-site centres.

Compared to hospital and industrial day care, on-site day care in office buildings is a relatively new phenomenon. The majority of work-place day care which falls into this category is sponsored by government agencies from several federal government departments in Washington, D.C., Boston and Chicago, State agencies in New York and California and a provincial ministry in Quebec, to day care at Toronto City Hall. The House of Commons in Ottawa plans to open a day care centre on Parliament Hill in the fall of 1981. At the United Nations headquarters in New York City, a proposal for an on-site centre for staff was rejected by the General Assembly in fall, 1980. Pinocchio Daycare Centre operates in the Sunlife Building in Edmonton and others provide care at several insurance companies in the United States.

Among the more interesting provisions of care in an office setting reported is that at the District of Columbia Courthouse. Drop-in care for the children, aged 18 months to 14 years, of defendents, plaintiffs, witnesses, probationers and jurors has been provided since 1974. Although this is not, strictly speaking, work-place day care, it bears enough of a resemblance to warrant inclusion.

Interestingly, sites in this category of day care for white collar workers in government and other office settings have so far had a lower attrition rate than centres located at hospitals or in industry (Welfare Research, Inc., 1980). However, because it is a relatively newer phenomenon, it is difficult to assess whether this pattern will remain stable.

There are a number of successful day care centres at industrial sites in the United States and Canada. Stride Rite Children's Centre in Boston, for example, has been in operation for ten years in conjunction with that company's children's shoe factory, and Children's Village, in the heart of the old garment centre in center-city Philadelphia, is reported to have contributed to revitalizing a dying industry. Located at an industrial park in Kanata, Ontario, A Child's Place, a private day care centre, will soon provide care for 120 children aged 6 weeks through school age, and Garderie sur une Patte in Drummondville, P.Q., serves children of workers at Celanese Corporation.

Day care centres at industrial locations have been the most unstable of the on-site centres. It is reported that by 1975, 82% of industrial on-site centres had closed (Welfare Research, Inc.). Fluctuations of the work force and economy were cited as accounting for many of the closings. It is possible that labour market and economic fluctuations affect private industry particularly powerfully.

Systematic research has not yet been conducted to determine why some programmes endure while others close down. Nevertheless, it does appear that two factors, viz., management support and parent involvement, contribute to

programme stability and duration. A number of the centres which have run successful programmes for a number of years tend to enjoy ongoing corporate support, both in the form of financial contributions and management's encouragement and commitment to the goals of the day care programme. These successful programmes also tend to have a high level of parental involvement (Welfare Research, Inc., 1980).

B. Off-Site Work-Related Day Care Centres

Another way in which employers or labour unions can provide direct day care service is by supporting a centre away from the work-site itself, located conveniently to workers' residential areas or along transportation routes. This may be a preferred model when the work-site itself is inappropriate because space is unavailable or because of the nature of a manufacturing operation. In some instances, parents may prefer day care out of the industrial area, particularly if workers from an industry live in one place: this is the case in Freeport, Texas where Intermedics Corporation has established a day care centre in a residential area about twenty minutes from the plant. A variation of this model is provided by the seven day care centres operated in Chicago, Maryland, Pennsylvania and Virginia by the Health and Welfare Fund of the Amalgamated Clothing and Textile Workers' Union. These centres have been established in garment industry locations convenient to union members who work for various employers; they are also open to community members. Hospitals too, can provide care for employees off the work-site itself, as does the downtown Winnipeg Health Sciences Centre. This day care centre for 160 children is located at the edge of the complex of hospital buildings in a former public school. Another interesting example of off-site care is the school-age summer programme run by Fel-Pro Manufacturing Company in Skokie, Illinois which operates at a nearby rural tract of land owned by the company.

C. The Consortium Model

Work-related day care centres developed by several firms who combine to form a consortia are another alternative to on-site day care. This system should be attractive to employers whose own work force has a need for

day care but is not large enough to justify formation of an on-site centre. Consortium centres will probably be located off-site but could be placed at a site housing several employers. Alternatively, one member of the consortium may assume responsibility for housing the centre.

The best known work-related day care founded by a consortium is the Northside Child Development Centre in Minneapolis, originally supported by Control Data Corporation, Pillsbury, Northwestern Bell Telephone, Lutheran Brotherhood Insurance Company, Northern States Power Company, and two banks, Minnesota Federal Reserve Bank and Farmer's and Mechanic's Savings and Loan Company. The Centre has been in existence since 1971 but is no longer supported by the parent companies. Instead, it receives federal funding and although it still services children from the consortium, functions as a community day care centre. Another consortium model is the Broadcasters' Child Development Centre in Washington, D.C. Located in a downtown church, the centre was founded by a group of parents in the broadcasting industry. It received initial start-up loans from a number of television and radio stations and planning money from NATAS, the television workers' trade association. Children's Village, an on-site centre, was founded in 1976 by a consortium of labour unions and business people as part of an economic development plan to revitalize central Philadelphia's dying garment industry. Although the International Ladies Garment Workers' Union provided funds for research and planning, neither the union nor employers regularly contribute to the Centre. Instead, demonstration project funding has come from the state government.

There are several other consortia in the United States which have recently opened on- and off-site day care centres or will soon do so; there are presently none in Canada.

D. Indirect Support of Work-Related Day Care

If a centre is not appropriate, there are alternative ways in which management or labour can assist families with day care needs. These include: recruitment, training or support of family day care providers; providing

slots in a community day care centre; providing information and referral to parents; subsidizing day care fees in the open market with a voucher or child care allowance or, in the case of labour unions, including provisions related to day care in contract negotiations. It is important to recognize that most of these options do not contribute to solving the day care problems of the larger community by increasing the number of available spaces. They do, however, increase the supply of day care available to particular groups of working parents. In addition to the models described above, there are many possible variations on these themes.

One interesting family day care programme in San Francisco, Asians, Inc., serves twelve hospitals, a fire department and a sheriff's department. These rather unlikely partners are linked by one common interest: a need for care for the children of night workers. Asians, Inc.'s family day care providers care for children at several apartment buildings the group has bought.

A variation on the family day care model was Illinois Bell's provision of information and referral services to employees. The company arranged to recruit and train family day care providers if care couldn't be found; thus more day care speaces were generated. Information and referral services are also provided by Polaroid Corporation in Cambridge, Massachusetts. In addition, Polaroid employees receive vouchers to subsidize community day care as a benefit.

Purchasing or arranging for spaces in a community day care centre is another alternative which a union or employer can arrange. In Toronto, Manulife, an insurance company, provided a $12,000 grant for renovations at a community day care centre in exchange for priority on a number of spaces in the centre.

V. LABOUR UNIONS: A SPECIAL ROLE

Labour unions can play a multifaceted role in provision of work-related day care. They may help provide care by funding it directly, by cooperating as a member of a support group, or by negotiating for it. Thus, any of the preceeding models of work-related day care can be associated with a labour union.

One way in which a union may become involved in provision of day care is by including it as part of a collective bargaining agreement so that the employer provides service in some way. In 1975, a search of almost 3,000 American federal sector collective bargaining agreements produced 48 which included provisions related to child care (Haddad, 1979). Provisions of this sort encompass a wide variety of programmes, varying from relatively minor involvement, to full-scale programme sponsorship. Thus, one example of negotiated support for day care is the $30 a month taxable benefit paid by the Toronto YWCA which was agreed to in its contract with the Canadian Union of Public Employees Local 2189. A large scale program is that which was negotiated in 1966 by the Baltimore Region Joint Board of the Amalgamated Clothing and Textile Workers' Union, setting up a Health and Welfare fund to which about forty employers contributed 2% of their gross payrolls. The six centres, serving a total of 1,400 children, are housed in specifically built facilities. Construction and operating costs are provided out of the joint fund.

Unions can, of course, decide to support work-related day care out of their own funds. In this direct way, the planning costs for the Philadelphia Children's Village were paid by the International Ladies Garment Workers' Union; in Chicago, the Amalgamated Clothing and Textile Workers' day care centre is funded by union funds, rather than being a negotiated benefit.

It has been observed that trends in union involvement in the care of children seem to be toward flexible benefit plans, parental leave for child care and for negotiations with management for funding (Waldron, 1981). This position is articulated in the Ontario Federation of Labour's recent policy statement on day care as follows:

> "... affiliates (should) negotiate for family related provisions which will enable parents to share the caring and more easily combine work and home responsibilities. These might include:
>
> a) greater consideration be given to enabling parents with young children to work on a part-time basis, and to job-share,
> b) flexible working hours,
> c) allowances to cover day care costs,
> d) work place day care, where health and safety standards can be maintained..."
>
> (Ontario Federation of Labour, 1980)

VI. BENEFITS OF WORK-RELATED DAY CARE

A. Benefits to Employers

> No business or industrial plant would locate in a community that did not have a clean water supply. It would not locate in a community that did not have a decent transportation system. How many businesses, however, really concern themselves about community provisions for the proper care of children of their employees? Good day care is essential to the health of employees' children, to the mental health of the mother while they are working, and to the reduction of absenteeism and frequent job turnover. (Heinze, 1965)

An important question which arises in any discussion of work-related day care is what is the motivation for employers to be interested in day care? Some of these motives are mentioned in the remarks quoted above from a 1965 address by the President of the International Latex Corporation in the United States. In recent years, it has been documented in research and data kept by companies that, in addition to filling the needs of parents for day care, work-related day care can provide a number of benefits to employers.

Reduction of absenteeism, tardiness and job turnover, enhancement of the organization's recruiting ability, improvement of employee morale and of the employer's public image and provision of favourable publicity have been documented by Perry (1978). There is data to show that the use of quality, reliable day care has a positive effect on women's employment records. A University of Minnesota study which examined the relationship between employee work records and day care usage compared 30 mothers with children in high quality, reliable day care centres with a matched group of 30 mothers with children not enrolled, and found that mothers whose children have good day care have better employment records than those who don't (Milkovich and Gomez, 1976).

Among companies which have calculated such benefits has been Intermedics in Freeport, Texas, which reports substantial labour savings in reduced absenteeism, decrease in staff turnover, impressive recruiting advantages in a

town where labour is in short supply, and increased morale not only on the part of parents but other employees as well. Stride Rite Children's Centre provides considerable publicity for the parent company, Stride Rite Shoes.

B. Benefits to Parents

In addition to those kinds of tangible benefits, the effect of humanizing the work-place has been suggested as a more intangible benefit. Decrease in separation between work and home life, enhancing equality between men and women, and a reduction in the tendency to belittle the significance of child care as work for adults, are all long-term societal goals and work-related day care can contribute to their achievement (Wolf, 1981). The effects of humanizing the work-places by integrating high quality day care into the work-place can be a benefit to parents. Some users of work-place day care cite the positive value of familiarizing a child with the parent's work environment. Children have an opportunity to learn about the parent's work role, and to become acquainted with the parent's co-workers in the work-place. At the work-place day care programme at the U.S. National Institute of Health in Bethesda, Maryland, the parents act as resource persons, participating in educational programme activities. Children go on trips to see the parents at work; parents also visit the centre frequently. One parent of a child in this centre remarked with obvious satisfaction: "My son, Albert, says that he works at the National Institute of Health" (Galinsky and Hooks, 1977).

Other advantages which have been cited as deriving from day care related to the parents' work-places are: stable day care in a tight day care market at hours which suit particular work schedules; an opportunity for parents to become more closely involved with their child care arrangements and providers; and additional time for families to spend together - during the commute to and from work, and at lunch and break times (Friedman, 1980).

In addition to the benefits noted above, there is a cost factor which gives work-related day care programmes an obvious advantage to many working

parents. Day care on the open market is an expensive service; the cost of quality centre care in community-based programmes currently ranges between $200 and $400 per month. The subsidization which employers or unions provide to most existing work-related day care programmes can help to bring day care costs down to a level which parents can afford to pay.

On the other hand, some of these features can also be seen as drawbacks of on-site day care. For example, time spent commuting with small children in rush hour, instead of a positive experience, may be unpleasant and difficult. Some groups have objected to work-place day care on the grounds that it may, in a tight day care market, tie workers, particularly women, to poorly paid jobs which they would be reluctant to leave if daycare, especially inexpensive day care, were provided.

It is important once again, to consider work-related day care as one option in a range of alternatives, and to consider individual needs, preferences, and alternatives. For some parents, commuting time may be pleasant; others may prefer to avoid it and find suitable day care near home. A good example of a situation where all of the options should be considered is that of night time care for children of shiftworkers. Children, it is often argued, should sleep at home in their own beds. There are some categories of workers, such as hospital personnel, telephone operators, police and firefighters, who may have to work night shifts. If there is someone available to care for their child in their own home, they may indeed choose this option. On the other hand, this care may not exist or they may, because of cost, prefer that their children do their sleeping in a day care centre. In other words, night time care may be a benefit to some parents and not to others. So long as there is no evidence that this, or any other option, is harmful to children, there is a good case for including it as an alternative.

VII. KEY ISSUES IN WORK-RELATED DAY CARE

We are not accustomed to thinking about children in places of employment. The concept of children's day care offered in a factory, government

office building, hospital or other work-place setting is unfamiliar, and raises a number of questions. These questions include: a) management of work-related day care programmes; b) target population of users of such programmes; c) the location and setting of day care facilities in the work-place, and d) funding the work-related day care service. Some of these issues are quite controversial, and are the subject of considerable debate among policy makers and day care advocates.

A. Management of Work-Related Day Care

The design of a work-related day care programme must consider the manner in which the children's day care facility is integrated into the structure of the sponsoring organization. Whether that sponsor is a factory, a government ministry or department, a labour union, or other organization, it is unlikely to be an organization whose primary aim is the delivery of child care services. An important step in the planning of a work-related day care programme is to determine the relationship of the day care, with its goal of delivering high quality child care, to other units within the organization which may have competing goals. Further, in order for a work-related day care programme to provide stable, dependable, continuous high quality care, the programme must be protected against shifts in management priorities.

One of the concerns which has been raised about work-related day care has to do with competing goals and possible shifts in priorities. For example, an industry or a hospital which looks to the establishment of a day care centre only as a way of recruiting a needed female work force may lack commitment to high quality day care, or to its continuance if staffing needs shift.

It is possible, however, to establish a management structure which will articulate and integrate the variety of goals and find ways to manage shifting work force needs and commitments. In order for this structure to function most effectively, it will be most useful to include serious representation of all the groups who may have concerns with day care; management, unions

(if the work-place is unionized), representation from the outside community, day care professionals and parents.

Parent participation in programme planning and administration is believed to be related to successful implementation and continuance of work-related day care. Research carried out by Corning Glass as part of the planning for their own day care facility found that successful work-related day care centres reported parent involvement, whereas centres which had failed reported little or none. Parent commitment and involvement in programme is also cited as characteristic of successful on-site centres in a recent project which developed models for work-related day care (Welfare Research, Inc.).

The day care programme at the United States National Institutes of Health in Bethesda, Maryland, provides an example of the impact parent participation can have. The centre opened in 1973, operated by Education Systems Corporation, an educational contracting firm. Following two years of difficulties, including programming problems, parents' dissatisfaction with meals and snacks, and impending fee increases, a group of parents became incorporated as Parents of Preschoolers, a non-profit, tax exempt corporation, which took over operation of the centre. Parents participate in decisions regarding programme and curriculum, as well as in the administration of the centre. The parent-controlled centre now offers a successful programme with a high level of parental involvement (Galinsky and Hooks, 1977).

B. User Population

Planning for a work-related day care facility requires a judgment as to which employees are most likely to utilize such a programme. Traditionally, it has been believed to be the case that only female employees would make use of day care facilities. A majority of the work-related day care programmes in Canada and the United States reflect this pattern. Thus, we have seen establishment and employment-based child care in hospitals, and in those high-technology and low-skill, low-paying industries that tend to employ females.

Recent changes in the structure of family life appear to be effecting this pattern. It now appears that fathers as well as mothers can be expected to utilize work-related day care. An example of this phenomenon is provided by Garderie sur une Patte, the day care centre at the Celanese Corporation in Drummondville, Quebec. Opened in 1979, this on-site day care centre is fully enrolled with 60 children. Centre staff note with considerable interest that about half of the employees who have enrolled their children in the centre are male. Intermedics figures report that at their day care centre, in an industrial operation which is heavily female, 15% of the parents bringing children are fathers. Neither Corning Glass nor Wang Laboratories in Boston, both operating on-site day care centres, are organizations that have primarily female populations. Further, mothers and fathers may not be the only employees who utilize work-related day care services. It may be decided that grandparents, for example, may bring their grandchildren to their work-place's day care service.

A work-related day care facility can be designed to serve exclusively the children of employees, or it can also be open to the surrounding community. Many programmes opt for a community service model, in which employees are given first priority for spaces, and the community at large has access as well; there are some programmes where there is no distinction made between community members and employees. One obvious advantage of this policy is that it increases the probability that all day care slots will stay filled, regardless of fluctuations in the work force; another advantage of giving the community access to the programme is that it enhances the community image of the sponsoring organization, whether employer or union.

C. Work Settings

The actual work-site location for child care is an issue to many who consider the on-site day care alternative. Questions of health and safety risks, as well as noise factors must be considered when planning a work-related day care programme. Clearly, there are some work environments which would be inappropriate for the care of young children; in these cases, support for day care at other locations could be arranged. Nevertheless,

there are many environments which could support a child care facility in or near the work-place. In most jurisdictions, day care programmes must conform to legislated standards for the physical environment of care. These standards generally ensure that a group day care facility cannot expose children to health and safety risks.

Gary T. Moore, a director of the interdisciplinary Children's Environment Project at the University of Wisconsin - Milwaukee, offers the following set of four criteria to be used in selection of work-place day care sites:

1. Adequate total site size: approximately 0.03 acres per child in a tight urban location and 0.06 acres per child in a suburban or rural location.

2. Provision for outdoor play yards directly adjoining the building and directly accessible from every indoor activity space.

3. Access to community resources and services and places of interest and learning potential to children, for example, fields, streams, woods, libraries, museums, galleries, planetaria, zoos, botanical gardens, interesting shops, and interesting visible places of work.

4. Separation from noxious and dangerous elements, for example, arterial streets and roads; heavily used intersections; railroads; service yards; storage depots; sources of dust, fumes, smoke, car exhausts, and industrial pollutants; and noise from manufacturing plants. (Moore, 1981)

D. Programme Funding

The funding of work-related day care services will be, of course, an issue which will arouse considerable interest. Supporters of these services will probably want to know how much it will cost; parents may want to know how little it can cost. The funding issue is an extremely complicated one, with many variations.

Funding can come from three main sources. Parents' fees, a variety of government sources, and employer or union contributions generally constitute the bulk of the funding, with the additional possibility of community or private donations making a fourth, less common strategy.

Parents' fees may range from nothing to full costs of the day care. A number of day care centres - the Amalgamated Clothing and Textile Workers' Union and Intermedics, for example - charge parents very low fees; at other centres, parents pay full or almost full costs. Fees may be applied on a sliding fee scale based on income, or may be calculated as a percentage of salary as at Stride Rite. Under such a plan, the fees for parents at the upper income ranges may exceed the actual cost of care. Their contribution, in effect, subsidizes the costs of low-income parents, whose fees are calculated below cost. Another way to handle the issue of fees is to consider day care a benefit comparable to, for example, unemployment insurance, and arrange to have all employees contribute to the day care funds whether or not they use day care.

Government sources fall into several distinct areas. First, the ordinary funding for which day care programmes in various jurisdictions generally qualify usually will apply to work-related programmes. This will usually be in the form of a per child subsidy for which parents need to quality and/or as a maintenance grant to a programme. Second, there may be special grants for which day care programmes may qualify: start-up money to support incentives in work-related day care, as in Ontario in 1981, or demonstration funding for innovative projects, as in the case of the funding provided by the State of Pennsylvania to Children's Village in Philadelphia. Third, a variety of government programmes which have broad guidelines may often be applied to work-related day care programmes. For example Canadian federal or provincial summer employment programs may provide some salary money or special physical development projects at work-related day care programmes. In the United States, CETA programmes have played this role.

Tax incentives in the form of reduced taxes on contributors' work-related day care also fall into the category of funds from government sources. Thus, a government may decide to increase employer participation in day care services by legislating attractive tax benefits. Existing tax legislation may also be used to full advantage by supporters of day care programmes.

The tax consequences of setting up a day care programmes in a particular way should be taken into account, as it is possible to derive considerable tax savings from certain organizational structures. Information dealing with the various tax options has been collected and made available in considerable detail in the United States (CCH Editorial staff; Solomon and Pollack).

Contributions from employers or labour unions can be structured in a wide variety of ways, ranging from assumption of full or almost full responsibility for funding the programme, as in the case of the Amalgamated Clothing and Textile Workers' centres, to voluntary donations as in the case of Children's Village in Philadelphia. Money for consultation or planning in the initial stages of a rogramme, loans, perhaps at a favourable rate of interest, capital costs, partial operating costs, and provision of services, space or goods are all ways in which day care can be supported financially.

VIII. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, then, current demographic trends indicate that the North American need for day care is unlikely to decrease in the present decade. Employer or union sponsored and supported day care services can be a part of a range of day care options from which parents can choose according to their own needs. The current interest in work-related day care seems to have arisen out of a confluence of factors:

1. A need for day care perceived by employers;

2. A realization by employers that day care can provide some tangible benefits to them, namely, recruiting, public relations advantages, and a way of reducing employee stress, absenteeism, tardiness and turnover;

3. Changes in social attitudes and policies on the parts of some employers articulated as growing corporate responsibility; and

4. A new but recognizable trend on the part of organized labour to consider day care a high priority issue.

There are some areas where research could serve to support efforts in this field. Better data on parents' needs and preferences, documentation of factors contributing to success in formal evaluation studies and, in Canada, a good review of the funding and tax possibilities would be useful.

It appears that work-related day care will occupy a key place in the day care mosaic in North America in the near future. It is important to keep in mind the fact that its success or failure depends in large part on the same kinds of factors which make for the success or failure of any other kind of day care programme: accessibility to parents, ongoing commitment to the programme; parental involvement; affordable cost and, of course, high quality day care.

REFERENCES

Belsky, J. and Steinberg, L.D.
1978 The effects of daycare: A critical review. Child Development 49: 929-949.

CCH Editorial Staff Publication
1981 Tax incentives for employer-sponsored day care programs. Chicago, Illinois: Commerce Clearing House, Inc.

Etaugh, C.
1980 Effects of non-maternal care: Research evidence and popular views. American Psychologist, April, 309-319.

Friedman, D.
1980 Child care in the '80's - reaching out to business and labour. Child Care Information Exchange, Belmont, Massachusetts, 7-12.

Galinsky, E. and Hooks, W.H.
1977 The New Extended Family: Day Care that Works. Boston, Massachusetts: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Grossman, A.S.
1974 Almost half of all children have mothers in the labour force. Monthly Labor Review. Special labour force reports-summaries. June, 41-44.

Grubb, W. N.
1977 Alternate futures for child care. Childhood and Government Project, School of Law, University of California - Berkeley (mimeo).

Haddad, C.
1979 Local Union Guide for Establishing Child Care Centres. Labour Program Service, School of Labor and Industrial Relations. Michigan State University.

Heinze, W.O.
1965 The meaning of day care for business and industry. In Spotlight on Day Care, Proceedings of the National Conference on Day Care. Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Health and Welfare Canada
1979 Status of Day Care in Canada (draft). Ottawa, Ontario.

Hofferth, S.L.
1979 Daycare in the next decade: 1980-1990. Journal of Marriage and the Family. August, 649-657.

Johnson, L.C.
1977 Who Cares? Toronto, Ontario: Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto.

Metropolitan Toronto Daycare Planning Task Force
1981 Future directions for daycare service in Metropolitan Toronto. Final Report. City of Toronto Department of Social Services. April.

Milkovich, G.T. and Gomez, L.R.
1976 Day care and selected employee work behaviors. Academy of Management Journal 19(1): 111-115.

Moore, G.T.
1981 Facilities and equipment. In Employers and Child Care: Establishing Services Through the Workplace. Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Labor, Women's Bureau, January.

Ontario Federation of Labour
1980 Statement on day care. Twenty-fourth annual convention. November.

Perry, S.K.S.
1978 Survey and analysis of employer-sponsored day care in the United States. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin - Milwaukee.

Pyl, J.
1977 The development of day care in Ontario. Master's thesis, School of Social Work, Carleton University. May.

Rutter, M.
1981 Social-emotional consequences of day care for preschool children. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry 51(1): January, 4-28.

Saskatchewan Department of Labour, Women's Bureau
Industry and Day Care.

Schulz, P.
1978 Daycare in Canada: 1850-1962. In Good Day Care, K.G. Ross (ed.). Toronto: The Women's Press, 147-158.

Solomon, D.G. and Pollack, C.C.
1980 Federal child care tax incentives for employees. In Child Care Information Exchange. Belmont, Massachusetts: October.

Statistics Canada
1981 Historical Labour Force Statistics. Catalogue no. 71-201.

Statistics Canada
1980 Population projections for Canada and the provinces. Catalogue no. 91-520, projection series #3.

Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey
1975 Women who are Head or Spouse of Head of an Economic Family,
1980 by Marital Status, Labour Force Characteristics, Presence and Age of Children for Canada and Ontario. Unpublished tables.

Statistics Canada
1978 Vital Statistics, Births. Catalogue no. 84-204.

Stein, S.
1973 The company cares for children. In Child Care: Who Cares? P.F. Ruby (ed.). New York: Basic Books.

Steinfels, M.O.
1973 Who's Minding the Children?: The History and Politics of Day Care in America. New York: Simon and Schuster.

University of Regina, Saskatchewan
1980 Survey of child care preferences. Sample survey and data bank unit.

Waldron, K.
1981 Presentation at New Management Initiatives for Working Parents. Boston, Massachusetts, April 2-3.

Welfare Research, Inc.
1980 On Site Day Care: The State of the Art and Models Development. Albany: New York.

Whitbread, J.
1979 Who's taking care of the children? Family Circle 20: February, 88-103.

Wolf, D.
1981 Industry and child care in China: What does it say to us? Child Care Information Exchange. Belmont, Massachusetts. January.

Women's Bureau, United States Department of Labor
1981 Employers and child care: Establishing services through the workplace. Pamphlet 23, January.

Women's Bureau, United States Department of Labor
1970 Child care services provided by hospitals. Bulletin 295.

The Child in the City Programme

Related Publications of Interest

Child in the City Report Series (order from the Centre for Urban and Community Studies, 150 St. George Street, Toronto, M5A 1A1)

1. Jeffrey S. Leon, Legal Representation of Children in Selected Court Proceedings: The Capacity of Children to Retain Legal Counsel, December 1978, 120 pp., $3.50.

2. Joe Bolger, A Study of the Legal Drinking Age Policy in Ontario, September 1979, 41 pp., $2.25.

3. Katherine Catton, Wendy Graham and Ester Koulack, Doctors' Understanding of and Practices Regarding the Law of Minors' Medical Consent: A Pilot Study, October 1979, 96 pp., $3.50.

4. Suzanne Ziegler, Demographic Influences on Adolescents' Cross-Ethnic Friendship Patterns, October 1979, 31 pp., $2.00.

5. Suzanne Ziegler and Johanna King, Evaluating a Foster Grandparent Program in a Pediatric Hospital, March 1980, 52 pp., $2.75.

6. Susan Hodgson, Social Isolation: A Perspective on Primary Prevention, May 1981, approx. 60 pp.

7. Katherine Catton, Valerie Farrer and Wendy Graham, Adolescent Beliefs and Practices Regarding the Law of Minors' Medical Consent: A Pilot Study, October 1980, 100 pp., $4.00.

8. Fred Hill, The Lives and Times of Urban Adolescents: Activity Patterns and Neighbourhood Perceptions, November 1980, 106 pp., $4.00.

9. Saul V. Levine, The Psychological and Social Effects of Youth Unemployment, November 1980, 21 pp., $2.00.

10. Ester Koulack and Vivienne Young, The Student Employment Experience Centre: An Evaluation of a Work Experience Project for Out of School Young Adolescents, February 1981, 55 pp., $3.00.

Books

W. Michelson, S.V. Levine, E. Michelson (eds.), The Child in the City: Today and Tomorrow, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1979, 275 pp.

W. Michelson, S.V. Levine, A.R. Spina (eds.), The Child in the City: Changes and Challenges, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1979, 600 pp.

W. Michelson, E. Michelson (eds.), Managing Urban Space in the Interests of Children, Canada/MAB Secretariat, Ottawa, 1980, 255 pp.